



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/982,530	10/18/2001	Ross Faulkner Smith	60001.0097US01/MS172025.1	7764
27488	7590	10/20/2005	EXAMINER	
MICROSOFT CORPORATION C/O MERCHANT & GOULD, L.L.C. P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			ENGLAND, DAVID E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2143	
DATE MAILED: 10/20/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/982,530

Applicant(s)

SMITH ET AL.

Examiner

David E. England

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 19 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 11, 19 and 20 are presented for examination.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1 – 11, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

4. In claims 1 and 5, the limitation of, “the client-side system logs, in a logging file, any user interactions with an application program module”, is not described in the specification to have one skill in the art to ascertain how the client-side system can log in a log file any user interactions with the application program module. If the claimed invention could truly log any user interactions with the application program module, then the system could log the user reading the display of the application program module. This is not describe in the specification. Furthermore, Applicant’s specification states that only specific “items may be recorded” which is not “any”. What is described in the specification is that, “*For any action that a user performs in the software application, several items may be recorded in a data file such as a user ID, an*

absolute time-stamp, the method invoked (keyboard, mouse, etc.) including application source (if the software application includes more than one application), and details such as the dialog invoked, button pressed, menu used, menu item selected, application launch, application termination, as well as environment variables, such as operating system, screen resolution, etc.

5. To enable logging within the application program module, the user, in one embodiment of the present invention, agrees to have their actions monitored in exchange an incentive (such as free software) and submits a survey that may collect demographic information about that user. If accepted to the study, the user receives a 10 copy of the software application, as well as a set-up program that sets up the study on the users machine(s).”, (pages 3 and 4 of the Applicant’s specification). As the Applicant can see that not all or “any” user interactions are logged into a logging file. Furthermore, the limitation of, “wherein when any feature of the application program module is used, one of the plurality of hooks is triggered and a data record is generated,” is also applied to the above cited area.

6. All other claims are rejected for their dependency on the claims discussed above.

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2143

9. The limitation of, “dialog invoked” does not describe what type of “dialog” and is therefore indefinite. For example, is the user talking to the computer verbally, typing information, using a mouse, or user communicating to another device through a network. Applicant is asked to amend this limitation to aid in further defining the specific abilities of the invention.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11. Claims 1, 3, 6, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Motoyama et al. U.S. Patent No. 6662225, (hereinafter Motoyama).

12. Referencing claim 1, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Motoyama teaches a client-side system stored on a computer, wherein the client-side system logs, in a logging file, any user interactions with an application program module and periodically uploads the logging files to a remote server system for analysis of the logging file, wherein the client-side system comprises:

13. a logging code in communication with the application program module, wherein the logging code comprises a plurality of hooks into the application program module and an

Art Unit: 2143

operating system of the computer, wherein when any feature of the application program module is used, one of the plurality of hooks is triggered and a data record is generated, (e.g., col. 14, lines 6 – 54);

14. a logging file in communication with the logging code, wherein the logging code stores the data record in the logging file, (e.g., col. 14, lines 6 – 54); and

15. a script file in communication with the logging file, wherein the script file is operative to upload the logging file to the remote server system, (e.g., col. 14, lines 6 – 54).

16. Referencing claim 3, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Motoyama teaches the script file uploads the logging file to the remote server system via an Internet connection, (e.g., col. 8, lines 54 – 67).

17. Referencing claim 6, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Motoyama teaches each recorded user interaction comprises a time stamp, (e.g., col. 15, lines 13 – 20),

18. a user identification, (e.g., col. 15, lines 36 – 49),

19. a UI element identifier, (e.g., col. 16, lines 5 – 19), and

20. a description of the method invoked to interact with the software application program module, (e.g., col. 16, lines 48 – 67).

21. Referencing claim 19, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Motoyama teaches each recorded user interaction further comprises at least one of the following;

22. an application source, (e.g., Abstract & col. 12, line 47 – col. 13, line 16);

Art Unit: 2143

23. dialog invoked, (e.g., Abstract & col. 12, line 47 – col. 13, line 16);
  24. button pressed, (e.g., Abstract & col. 12, line 47 – col. 13, line 16);
  25. menu used, (e.g., Abstract & col. 12, line 47 – col. 13, line 16);
  26. menu item selected, (e.g., Abstract & col. 12, line 47 – col. 13, line 16);
  27. application launch, (e.g., Abstract);
  28. application termination;
  29. operating system used, (e.g., Abstract & col. 12, line 47 – col. 13, line 16); and
  30. screen resolution.
31. Referencing claim 20, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Motoyama teaches the description of the method invoked to interact with the software application program module comprises at least one of keyboard or mouse, (e.g., Abstract & col. 12, line 47 – col. 13, line 16).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

32. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

33. Claims 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motoyama in view of Burgess et al. (5796633) (hereinafter Burgess).

Art Unit: 2143

34. Referencing claim 2, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Motoyama teaches a scheduled event stored in the operating system, wherein, in response to the scheduled event being triggered, the script file uploads the logging file to the remote server system, (e.g., col. 15, line 50 – col. 16, line 4, “*trigger*”), but does not specifically teach a scheduled event stored in the operating system and created in a predetermined time period. Burgess teaches a scheduled event stored in the operating system and created in a predetermined time period, (e.g., col. 8, lines 19 – 63, “*Logging thread 50 logs performance data each predetermined time interval.*”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Burgess with Motoyama because starting and ending specific events and labeling them with a time stamp in the operating system give the system the ability to maintain the newest information available and discard old information that isn’t of use to the system anymore.

35. Referencing claim 5, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Motoyama teaches a computer-implemented method for tracking any user interactions with a software application program module stored on the user's computer, the method comprising the steps of:

36. determining any user interaction with the software application program module, (e.g., col. 14, lines 6 – 54);

37. recording the user interaction in a logging file on the computer, (e.g., col. 14, lines 6 – 54);

38. determining that a scheduled event is triggered, (e.g., col. 14, lines 6 – 54);

39. in response to the scheduled event triggering, determining whether the logging file exists, and, if so, then uploading the logging file to a remote analysis server, (e.g., col. 15, line 50 – col.



Art Unit: 2143

16, line 4), but does not specifically teach determining that a scheduled event is triggered during a predetermined time period. Burgess teaches determining that a scheduled event is triggered during a predetermined time period, (e.g., col. 8, lines 19 – 63, “*Logging thread 50 logs performance data each predetermined time interval.*”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Burgess with Motoyama because of similar reasons stated above.

40. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motoyama and Burgess in view of Jawahar et al. (6256620), (hereinafter Jawahar).

41. As per claim 7, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Motoyama and Burgess do not specifically teach the step of deleting the logging file on the computer after it has been uploaded. Jawahar teaches the step of deleting the logging file on the computer after it has been uploaded, (e.g., col. 15, lines 17 – 32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was conceived, to combine Jawahar with the combine system of Motoyama and Burgess because deleting the logging file after sending it to a server would free up more memory at the users terminal for additional logging data to be stored and transferred.

42. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motoyama, Burgess and Jawahar as applied to claims 5 – 7 above, and in view of Ploetz et al. (6738798), (hereinafter Ploetz).

Art Unit: 2143

43. As per claim 8, as closely as interpreted by the Examiner, Motoyama, Burgess and Jawahar do not specifically teach the step of renaming the logging file with a random number before uploading the logging file to the remote analysis server. Ploetz teaches the step of renaming the logging file with a random number before uploading the logging file to the remote analysis server, (e.g., col. 7, lines 45 – 64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was conceived, to combine Ploetz with the combine system of Motoyama, Burgess and Jawahar because renaming a file with a random number could prevent a system from naming a file with the same name.

44. Claims 4 and 9 – 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motoyama, Burgess, Jawahar and Ploetz as applied to claims 1 – 3 and 5 – 8 above, and in view of Godfrey et al. (6662217), (hereinafter Godfrey).

45. As per claim 4, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Motoyama, Burgess, Jawahar and Ploetz do not specifically teach the script file and logging code are generated by a set-up program module included with the application program module and stored on the computer. Godfrey teaches the script file and logging code are generated by a set-up program module included with the application program module and stored on the computer, (e.g., col. 5, lines 22 – 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was conceived, to combine Godfrey with the combine system of Motoyama, Burgess, Jawahar and Ploetz because if the user wishes to take part in testing it would be advantageous for a user to upload the proper modules to partake in such a test so the system can perform its tasks.

46. As per claim 9, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Motoyama teaches comprising the steps of opening a session with the remote analysis server, placing the logging file into a database record set and wherein the step of uploading the logging file comprises posting the database record set to the remote analysis server, (e.g., col. 16, lines 48 – 67), but does not specifically teach Active Data Object database. Godfrey teaches the steps of opening an Active Data Object (ADO) session with the remote analysis server, placing the logging file into an ADO database record set and wherein the step of uploading the logging file comprises posting the ADO database record set to the remote analysis server, (e.g., col. 5, lines 13 – 28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was conceived, to combine Godfrey with the combine system of Motoyama, Burgess, Jawahar and Ploetz because utilizing an ADO database gives the system the ability for the database to reside anywhere on the network.

47. As per claim 10, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Motoyama does not specifically teach the remote analysis server is a Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) server. Jawahar teaches the remote analysis server is a Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) server, (e.g., col. 4, lines 1 – 14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was conceived, to combine Jawahar with the combine system of Motoyama and Burgess because utilizing an HTTP server, (web server), give the system the ability to communicate with users from different networks on the web.

Art Unit: 2143

48. As per claim 11, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Motoyama teaches a computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions, which when executed, are operable to perform the steps of claim 10, (e.g., col. 14, lines 6 – 16).

### *Response to Arguments*

49. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 11, 19 and 20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection under 112 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph and Burgess.

### *Conclusion*

50. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2143

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 571-272-3912.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David E. England  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2143

De



DAVID WILEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100